

REMARKS

In the response to argument, the Examiner points out that at one place in the specification, namely, column 3, lines 35-40, the Park reference teaches exactly the opposite of what it teaches in every other single instance where the implantation and its effect on the insulating layer is discussed. In fact, at ten other instances, the exact same treatment is said to have the exact opposite effect as in the one instance cited by the Examiner. Thus, there can be no reasonable conclusion except that the one cited instance is a typographical error.

Not only are there ten instances where the opposite effect is described, but in all of the claims, the opposite effect is described. Moreover, right after the portion cited by the Examiner at column 3, lines 41-45, the opposite effect is described. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the one instance must be an error. In other words, the exact same treatment cannot have an effect and the opposite effect. The only reasonable conclusion is that, of the eleven times the treatment is mentioned, the one time where it describes one effect different than the other ten instances where the effect is described must be a typographical error.

The instances where the opposite effect of that cited by the Examiner are described in the reference are as follows:

1. In the Abstract it is stated that ions can be implanted “which decrease an etch rate of the insulating layer.”
2. In the Summary of the Invention at column 2, lines 52-53, it is stated that “implanting ions into the insulating layer which decrease an etch rate of the layer.”
3. Also in the Summary of the Invention at column 2, lines 65-68, it is stated that the dose of nitrogen is sufficient “to increase the etch resistivity of the oxide layer.”
4. In the instance already mentioned, also in the Summary, right after the one cited by the Examiner, it is stated that “the etch rate thereof can be reduced, thus, allowing the selective removal of the oxide layer over the substrate.” See column 3, lines 41-45.
5. At column 4, lines 48-50, it is stated that the implantation may be used “to increase the etch resistivity of the doped oxide layer 50.”
6. At column 5, lines 7-8, it is stated that “the etching resistivity of the oxide filling the trench can be increased.”

7. At column 5, lines 51-55, it is stated that the oxide deposited in the trench can be "implanted to decrease an etch rate of the oxide layer" and that "this decreased etch rate allows selective removal of the mask layers."

8. Claim 8 calls for implanting ions into an insulating layer which decrease an etch rate of the insulating layer.

9. Claim 13 calls for implanting nitrogen into said insulating layer which decrease an etch rate of the insulating layer.

10. Claim 15 calls for implanting ions into said doped and undoped insulating layers which decrease an etch rate of the doped and undoped insulating layers.

Thus, since there are ten instances where one thing is asserted to happen and one instance where the opposite is asserted to happen from the same treatment, it must be reasonably concluded that the one contrary instance is a mistake.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The objections set forth to lines 7-8 of claim 22 has been corrected by an appropriate amendment.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/26/05



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation